

that package dealing with the question of emergency permits should surely be dealt with at the same time. There may be some minor differences between the amendments, but I think they are very minor. I believe the business of the House would be expedited if you took the whole package and dealt with them tomorrow, grouping No. 12 with Nos. 3 and 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), on the same point of order.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I would be concerned, without studying the point, whether motion No. 12 ought to be dealt with in a block if we are saying it ought to be dealt with, in terms of a vote, with items Nos. 3 and 4. If we are going to do that, I would certainly want it clearly understood that we would not necessarily agree. I see the hon. member for New Westminster agrees with that. Subject to that, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any difficulty in dealing with this matter. However, I must file this caveat: if some difficulty did develop on this point, I should like the opportunity to deal with the matter later in continuing with this point of order. But I really do not see any difficulty.

Mr. Woolliams: As I understand the agreement—and we are not trying to delay matters—it is that these first two amendments stand. There is one point in amendment No. 2 that concerns me. There is just one section of murder mentioned. That may be influenced by another bill just finished in the other place. I do not know whether that is the concern of the minister. I would ask that motions Nos. 1 and 2 be stood. If tomorrow we come back and speak on these matters, we are not trying to delay things. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) will co-operate with our party and the other parties in this regard, I think you will see us move along very quickly on this bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before the minister takes part in the point of order, it is the feeling of my colleagues and the Chair that motions Nos. 3 and 4 should be dealt with separately simply because there were objections earlier today to dealing with them together. If that were the wish of the House and nobody pressed us to make a decision otherwise, I think motion No. 12 would be called in due course; I do not think that the hon. member for New Westminster need have any fears in that regard.

If we were to take the course proposed, whether understood or misunderstood by the Chair, we would leave motion No. 2 open to be completed, No. 3 would be stood, No. 4 would be stood and then we could proceed with the package that I understand the hon. member for New Westminster is agreeable to, namely, the seven motions in his name. That would leave us free to go to No. 3 tomorrow after orders of the day, when the right hon. member for Prince Albert can present his motion. We would then go back and complete No. 2 and carry on in logical sequence from there.

Mr. Baker: Is that an order of the House, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, hon. members have talked about agreements. I should make it clear that the only agreement I know anything about is that if we complete motion No. 2, then in the ordinary course—I expect we would,

Protection of Privacy

since hon. members said they wanted to move along—we would not proceed with No. 3 because of a certain understanding about it not being desirable to bring it forward tonight. I do not see the particular point in standing No. 2 in an incomplete state at this time; but I have no objection to agreeing, if it is agreeable to the hon. member for New Westminster, to interrupt his motion and return to No. 3 in the middle of that debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the point I was going to make is parallel to what the Minister of Justice has said. If we have completed the debate on No. 2, why do we need to stand it? It is completely agreed that any vote on it would be deferred. Could we not now call for the yeas and nays, and however it goes, five members probably will stand, and the vote on No. 2 will be deferred. Then we would proceed to the motions proposed by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Unless there are members who still wish to speak on No. 2, it seems to me that this is the best way of proceeding. Of course, the votes are deferred until such time as Mr. Speaker calls them, or until the House leaders get together and suggest something that is agreeable to all members. But certainly that vote would not be taken tonight. If that is agreeable, I would put No. 2 and then we could go on to the package of seven motions in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I would like No. 2 to be stood. Maybe I am the only one, but there is a technical point that I notice here. I am not prepared to speak on it tonight, but I should like to have the opportunity tomorrow. Surely I could do that. It could be stood and we could go on to the other package, and then the agreement with reference to the motion of the right hon. member for Prince Albert could be put into effect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This would require the unanimous consent of the House. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has requested, regarding motion No. 2, that he be permitted to reserve his right to speak, or perhaps not to speak on it, until another occasion. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stanbury: Another filibuster.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Then motions Nos. 3 and 4 are stood, with the agreement of the House, and it is also understood that No. 3 will be called immediately after orders of the day and routine proceedings are completed tomorrow. Is this also understood?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motions Nos. 2, 3 and 4 stood.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now proceed to the package in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster, motions Nos. 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 21. It is the understanding of the Chair that the hon. member for New Westminster is agreeable that these be put together for the purpose